

REMARKS

In the Office Action, Claims 8-10, 23, 24, 33, 34, 39 and 40 were allowed, and the other then pending claims were rejected over the prior art. Specifically, with respect to these rejected claims, Claims 1-7, 11-22, 25-32, 35-38 and 41-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being fully anticipated by European Patent 0,715,242 (Takashima).

Applicants herein ask that the claims be amended to place the application in condition for allowance without further amendment or argument.

First, with regard to Claims 1-13, Applicants herein ask that Claim 1 be amended to be identical in scope to allowed Claim 8. As a result, Claim 8 and Claim 2 are being cancelled; and Claims 4, 9 and 11 are being amended to be dependent from Claim 1 instead of now cancelled Claims 2 or 8. This places Claims 1, 3-7 and 11-13, which are all dependent from Claim 1, in condition for allowance, and also does not affect the allowability of Claims 9 and 10. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 3-7 and 11-13, and to allow these Claims.

With respect to Claims 14-27, Applicants herein request that Claim 14 be amended to include all of the features in allowed Claim 23, described in the same or narrower language, and also to include limitations from Claim 15, which was dependent from Claim 14. Claims 15 and 23 are being cancelled; and Claim 16, which is dependent from Claim 14, is being amended to remove a feature described in Claim 14. Claim 24 is being amended to be dependent from Claim 14 rather than the now cancelled Claim 23.

It is respectfully believed that these changes place Claim 14 and Claims 16-22 and 25-27, which are dependent from Claim 14, in condition for allowance, and also does not affect the allowability of Claim 24. Thus, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of, and to allow, Claims 14, 16-22, and 25-27.

Claim 28 is being amended to include the limitations of allowed Claim 33 and also the limitations of Claim 31, which was dependent from Claim 28. Claims 30-33 are being cancelled, and Claim 34 is being amended to be dependent from Claim 28 instead of Claim 33. This places Claim 28 and Claim 29, which is dependent from Claim 28, in condition for allowance, and these changes do not affect the allowability of Claim 34. The Examiner is requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 28 and 29, and to allow these claims.

With regard to Claims 35-40, Claim 35 is being amended herein to include the limitations of allowed Claim 39. Also, for the sake of consistency, Claim 35 is also being amended to describe a second key for decrypting a first key. Claims 36 and 39 are being cancelled. Claim 38 is being amended to be dependent from Claim 35 and to remove from Claim 38 the features described in Claim 35. Claims 37 and 40 are being amended to be dependent from Claim 35 instead of Claims 36 and 39. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments place Claims 35, 37 and 38 in condition for allowance, and do not affect the allowability of Claim 40. In view of this, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 35, 37 and 38, and to allow these claims.


Claims 41-43 are directed to a program storage device embodying a computer program comprised of specified method steps. It is noted that none of Claims 41-43 were allowed; however, Claim 41 is herein being amended to describe verbatim the method steps set forth in

Claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above in connection with Claim 1, this amendment also places claim 41 in condition for allowance. Claim 42 is being cancelled. Claim 43 is dependent from, and is allowable with, Claim 41. the Examiner is, consequently, requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of, and to allow, Claims 41 and 43.

The amendments requested herein do not raise any new issues and do not require any further searching by the Examiner. Moreover, these amendments place the application in condition for allowance. It is respectfully submitted that entry of this Amendment is appropriate, and such entry is respectfully requested.

For the reasons advanced above, the Examiner is asked to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 3-7, 11-14, 16-22, 25-29, 35, 37, 38 and 41-43. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,


John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy